

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 38 and 41 to 46 were pending on the November 5, 2010, notification date of the non-final Office Action. Claims 2, 13, 14, 21, 32, 33, 41, 42, and 44 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Independent claims 1, 12, 20, and 31 have been amended, and new claims 47 to 54 have been added. Because support for the new claims is found throughout the disclosure, including at least ¶¶ [0032] and [0033] of the specification (numbered as published), the Applicant submits that no new matter has been added. Reconsideration and further examination are requested.

Initially, the undersigned requests that the Examiner wait until after the personal interview that is scheduled for March 23, 2011, is conducted before examining the claims.

In the Office Action, claims 1 to 11, 15 to 30, 34 to 40, and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Pat. No. 6,101,515 (“Wical ‘515”) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,038,560 (“Wical ‘560”), U.S. Pat. No. 5,806,060 (“Borgida”), and U.S. Pat. No. 5,930,788 (“Wical”); and claims 12 to 14, 31 to 33, 41 and 43 to 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Wical ‘515, Wical ‘560, and Borgida. Withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is requested.

The independent claims have been amended to express in more clear form the distinctive features of the claimed inventions. For instance, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite the feature that “*each concept* in the existing machine-readable network of interrelated concepts comprises a normalized semantic representation that *is defined* in the existing machine-readable network of interrelated concepts *by a group of synonyms*.” The other independent claims have been similarly amended.

The cited portions of Wical ‘515 do not disclose, teach or suggest this feature. Rather, Wical ‘515 describes a “learning system [that] analyzes data to select the best category, if possible, to classify terms,” where “categories refer to areas of interest.” See Wical ‘515, col. 16, ll. 62-67. Each particular category of the “categorization schema” of Wical ‘515 “may include sub-categories,” and is represented by a node that specifies a “number of documents classified for [a] term in the respective node.” See Wical, col. 8, ll. 23-46; and col. 9, ll. 14-31.

While each category of Wical ‘515 may include one or more sub-categories, and each sub-category may specify one or more documents, nothing in Wical ‘515 requires that the sub-categories of each category, or the documents of each sub-category, be “defined” by “a group of

synonyms,” as claimed. Accordingly, even if one were to assume, as the Examiner has, that an “area of interest,” “category,” or a “sub-category” were the same as a “concept,” the Applicant submits that Wical ‘515 still does not describe the newly amended features of the independent claims.

The remaining references do not remedy these particular deficiencies of Wical ‘515. The other rejected claims in the application are each dependent on the independent claims, and are allowable for at least the above reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define additional aspects of the disclosure, however, the individual consideration of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Furthermore, new dependent claims 47, 49, 51 and 53 recite a “strength value that is specific to the direction” that is characterized by the relationship type, and dependent claims 48, 50, 52 and 54 recite that the strength value in the direction is different than the strength value in a direction that is opposite to the direction. While Wical ‘515 describes a “strength for certain nodes [that] reflects the strength of the classification of the term for the category,” nothing in Wical ‘515 describes this strength as being specific to a direction, or being different than a strength value in an opposite direction. *See* Wical, col. 10, ll. 34-40. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that Wical ‘515 also does not disclose each and every element of the new dependent claims.

Withdrawal of the § 103 rejection is requested. No other matters being raised, the Applicant submits that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Conclusion

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the Applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the Applicant’s selecting some particular arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist. Finally, the Applicant’s decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that the Applicant agrees with any positions taken by the examiner with respect to that claim or other claims.

Applicant : Adam J. Weissman et al.
Serial No. : 10/748,399
Filed : December 30, 2003
Page : 16 of 16

Attorney's Docket No.: 16113-0422001

The \$130 fee for the extension is being paid by way of the Electronic Filing System (EFS).

The Applicant believes that no other fees are due. Please apply any charges not otherwise paid, or apply any credits, to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 3, 2011

/David E. A. Jordan/
David E. A. Jordan
Reg. No. 50,325

Customer Number 26192
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945
40709756